

Admission Delayed: The Influence of Sectional and Political Opposition in Congress on Statehood for Hawaii

Roger J. Bell

"The power to create states belongs to the people who inhabit them," Senator Lewis Cass observed in the debate on Californian statehood in 1850, but "the power to admit them into the Union belongs to Congress."¹ Article IV of the United States Constitution grants Congress the power to admit new states to the Union. However Congress is not compelled to admit any incorporated territory, even if the territory should fulfil the so-called traditional requirements for statehood. These demand that the proposed new state has sufficient resources and population to support state government and the cost of Federal government; that the inhabitants of the proposed state be sympathetic to the principles of American democracy; and that a majority of the territorial electorate desire immediate statehood.² Yet few territories were admitted to statehood immediately upon fulfilling these criteria for entry. Most confronted considerable politically-motivated or sectionally-based opposition in Congress to their statehood objectives. Of the thirty-seven states admitted to the Union since 1789, however, the question of statehood for the non-contiguous but constitutionally incorporated territory of Hawaii was more thoroughly studied and subject to more protracted opposition than any statehood proposal ever presented to Congress.

Hawaii retained territorial status for longer than any incorporated territory except New Mexico, which was subject to this form of government for one year longer than Hawaii. The record of testimony and information established through thirty-four Congressional hearings and reports, and forty days of intermittent debate in Congress on Hawaii³ was more voluminous and complete than for any other territory.⁴ Commencing in 1903 the Hawaiian legislature

Roger Bell is associated with the Department of History, University of Sydney, Australia.

frequently petitioned Congress for statehood. Admission bills were constantly introduced into Congress after 1919 by Hawaii's non-voting Delegates in the House of Representatives. In 1935, partly as a response to threatened discrimination by Congress against the local sugar industry, Hawaii began a forceful, organised and expensive campaign for political equality with the existing states.⁵ A plebiscite conducted in 1940 indicated that more than two-thirds of the territorial electorate favored statehood.⁶ All Gallup Polls conducted in the United States after 1945 revealed that a substantial majority consistently favored Hawaii's immediate admission.⁷ Before the outbreak of World War II a House investigating committee concluded that "Hawaii has fulfilled every [statehood] requirement heretofore exacted of Territories".⁸ After the war statehood was endorsed by both major national political parties, recommended by Truman and Eisenhower,⁹ and supported by an overwhelming majority of national newspapers.¹⁰ Moreover, as Donald Dedmon has concluded, in the protracted Congressional debates on the issue, "the affirmative side always had the stronger case."¹¹ Yet Congress refused to grant Hawaii equal status in the Union until 1959.

The Organic Act passed by Congress in 1900 granted Hawaii the legal right to eventual statehood. It incorporated the new territory into the Union in accordance with provisions previously applied to incorporated territories under the Northwest Ordinance, by declaring:

That the Constitution, and, except as herein otherwise provided, all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory as elsewhere in the United States.

Implicit in this clause was an assurance of ultimate statehood, as a variety of Supreme Court decisions subsequently acknowledged that the qualified political status of an incorporated territory was an intermediary step to eventual statehood.¹² No subsequent Congressional investigating committee ever contested Hawaii's legal entitlement to statehood.

Shortly after World War II Hawaii again initiated a vigorous campaign for prompt admission. A majority of Hawaii's residents endorsed immediate statehood. Perhaps more important, after almost half a century of economic, social and political development under territorial pupilage, the islands were fully qualified for admission and capable of supporting state government. By 1945-46 the value of real property and goods produced in the islands exceeded that of any territory at the time of admission, except Oklahoma,

and was valued above that of at least ten existing states. It consistently paid more in taxes to the Federal Treasury than it received in Federal appropriations. Closely integrated with the national economy, Hawaii's economy was self-sustaining and stable, despite its lack of a diversified base. Hawaii was also an important factor in the national economy. The value of commerce between Hawaii and continental United States exceeded the value of trade between the United States and all but five countries. Moreover, Hawaii paid more in Federal taxes annually than fourteen of the states.¹³ It was thus fully capable of supporting the cost of state government.

The composition and structure of Hawaii's population was unlike that of any previous territory, but it clearly met the requirements for statehood. In 1945 its population was larger than that of any territory at the time of admission, except Oklahoma. Significantly, this population had demonstrated that it met perhaps the most important criteria for statehood—it was imbued with and sympathetic towards the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government. Democratic municipal and territorial government had been maintained in the territory after annexation, except for the years 1941–1945 when martial law was imposed on the territory. Moreover the absence of war-time sabotage, and the important role of Hawaii-born combat troops during World War II, conclusively demonstrated the loyalty of Hawaii's people and provided substantial evidence of their successful assimilation and Americanization.¹⁴

This high degree of assimilation was conditioned by more than fifty years of gradual social change in the unique Hawaiian community. By 1945 over eighty-five percent of Hawaii's people were born either in Hawaii or continental United States. Caucasians comprised approximately thirty-four percent of the population; the Japanese ethnic group comprised approximately thirty-two percent. The remainder of the population was largely of Hawaiian, Filipino or Chinese ancestry.¹⁵ Despite these diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds, descendants of non-Caucasian immigrants effected a remarkable degree of social integration and adjustment to American life. No criterion is adequate as an index of the decline of ethnic-group consciousness of an individual in society. Nonetheless, as sociologist Andrew Lind has observed, "perhaps the ultimate criterion of intimacy in interethnic relations, at least under American rules of the game, is marriage."¹⁶ From 1912 to 1945 the proportion of interracial marriages in Hawaii increased from fourteen percent to almost forty percent of all marriages.¹⁷ Other indices support the

view that ethnocentricism and racial consciousness had substantially declined by 1946. After 1931 all major ethnic groups were represented in the territorial legislature, and bloc voting along ethnic lines was not a serious problem.¹⁸ In contrast to many Southern mainland states, no laws in Hawaii promoted racial segregation or discrimination. The *Christian Science Monitor* observed in 1946: "There is less racial friction and discrimination in Hawaii than in many mainland areas."¹⁹ The degree of assimilation of various ethnic groups and different generations within each group was not uniform. It depended largely on length of residence in the islands, economic and social status in the community, and educational opportunities and attainments. Nonetheless, as Hawaii's war experience demonstrated, all ethnic groups shared to a large degree the attitudes and ideals of their fellow Americans both in Hawaii and the United States generally.

More than eighty-five percent of Hawaii's 500,000 people were United States citizens by 1945.²⁰ Under territorial government, however, these citizens were denied full citizenship rights, most notably the right to elect a territorial governor, participate in Presidential elections, or send a voting delegation to the United States Congress. Despite this, all territorial residents were subject to Federal laws on taxation and military service. Increasingly, local support for immediate admission was motivated by a desire to gain political representation in national decision making and self government for the territory. Perhaps the best expression of this desire was the ratification of a proposed Hawaii State Constitution by an overwhelming majority of the territorial electorate in 1950.²¹ Post-war Hawaii unquestionably desired statehood and was fully qualified for it.

Fulfillment of the traditional criteria for statehood was a necessary precondition for admission, but it was not sufficient to ensure prompt or favorable action by Congress. The influence of a combination of sectional and states' rights considerations often largely determined the specific timing of admission of various territories granted statehood after 1789. It is suffice to cite the sectional division in Congress over the admission of "free" or "slave" states in the four decades prior to the Civil War, to indicate the importance of these influences. As statehood for Hawaii was an integral factor in the bitter post-war Congressional dispute over civil rights questions, the timing of its admission was also determined largely by a combination of sectional and states' rights considerations. During the protracted Congressional debate on Hawaiian statehood from 1947 to 1959 the decisive role

of these considerations in delaying Hawaii's admission to the Union was manifest.

Truman appointed a special Civil Rights Commission in 1946. It subsequently recommended that Congress enact substantive civil rights legislation to ensure the equal political rights of minorities, especially Negroes. In his State of the Union message of January 1948 Truman defined a new policy aimed at eliminating political or economic discrimination based on "race, or creed, or color, or land, or origin."²² In the following months he defined a ten-point program which provided for a Civil Rights Commission, anti-lynching laws, abolition of the poll-tax and the protection of voting rights for all citizens. Implementation of this comprehensive civil rights program, Truman emphasised, demanded not only the granting of full citizenship rights to minority groups in existing states, but immediate statehood for Hawaii. Statehood was essential if all United States citizens were to enjoy full and equal civil rights.²³ Yet even if Truman had not explicitly classified statehood for Hawaii as an aspect of his civil rights program, the two issues would nonetheless have become fused when considered by Congress. Indeed, the developing relationship between the issues was evidenced during Congressional debate on Hawaii prior to Truman's call for passage of comprehensive civil rights legislation in 1948.

On June 30, 1947 the House of Representatives voted for the first time on statehood for Hawaii. The legislation passed by a vote of 196 to 133. Only fifty-six Republicans opposed statehood; 141 supported it. In contrast, only fifty-five Democrats voted affirmatively, while seventy-seven voted negatively. Despite endorsement by the Democratic Administration, a majority of Democrats who voted opposed Hawaii's admission, and a majority of Republicans supported it. Opposition derived almost exclusively from the eleven Southern states, the "border" states of Missouri and Maryland, and some large Northern states, notably Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois and New Jersey. Most of the ninety-four Representatives who abstained from voting represented large Northern states. However a majority in only one Northern state—Pennsylvania—voted against admission. In contrast, four former Confederate states—Alabama, Arkansas, Virginia and Texas—voted unanimously against statehood. A majority of Representatives from the Southern states of Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and the "border" states of Missouri and Maryland, voted negatively. The eleven Southern states provided only fifteen affirmative votes and sixty-three opposition votes. All but two Southern opponents

were Democrats.²⁴ Given this voting pattern, the *Honolulu Star Bulletin's* suggestion that the vote did not reflect "partisan or sectional" interests,²⁵ was clearly inaccurate.

The voting alignments reflected the influence of important political and sectional factors which subsequently had a decisive impact on Hawaii's attempt to gain statehood. Majority Republican support and majority Democratic opposition resulted in part from partisan political considerations. Hawaii was traditionally a Republican territory.²⁶ Republicans anticipated that Hawaii statehood would increase the Republican majority in the Senate. Some Democrats opposed admission because they anticipated that it would reduce their party's prospect of regaining control of the Senate. Moreover, a number of Democrats wanted to delay action on Hawaii until Alaska could be admitted simultaneously. Alaska was traditionally a strong Democratic territory.²⁷ Thus some Democrats who supported Hawaii, favored concurrent admission of both territories. Yet the influence of partisan political factors should not be overestimated. Although Republican support for Hawaii was stronger than Democratic support, the vote nonetheless indicated considerable bipartisan support for Hawaii.

Related sectional and racial factors, rather than political considerations, were the major determinants of the voting pattern on the statehood bill. Strongest opposition derived from the most populous states and the Southern states, and was motivated by a desire to preserve existing state representation in Congress, especially the Senate. The admission of Hawaii with a comparatively small population had profound implications for existing states, as it threatened to reduce their voting strength in Congress. Representative Coudert (N.Y.) protested that the Hawaii bill would in effect grant Hawaii one Senator for every 35,000 voters. In contrast, in New York state, one Senator represented 2,500,000 citizens.²⁸ Southern opposition to Hawaii's admission was compounded by an overriding concern that Representatives and Senators elected by Hawaii would actively promote civil rights legislation in Congress. Larcade (La.), one of the few Southern Democratic proponents of statehood for Hawaii, acknowledged the influence of this factor when he declared:

... my people, the South, and myself have definite opinions in regard to the racial question; however on my visit to Hawaii I observed men and women of all races intermingling and assimilating in perfect harmony. If that is their way of life, that is their business, and they are entitled to their way of life. In the South

we do not approve of this way of life, and this should be our business; and like Hawaii, all that we ask is that we be given the same privilege to make our own determination in this respect.²⁹

However, in contrast to Larcade, a majority of Southern Congressmen interpreted Hawaiian statehood as a factor which might irrevocably reduce the right of Southern states to determine domestic racial policies and practice by adding voting strength to the growing "liberal", anti-segregationist bloc in the Senate. Thus, to a majority of Southerners, Hawaii statehood constituted a direct threat to their sectional interests. Their opposition to the admission of the racially tolerant Hawaii was predicated largely on a desire to preserve their existing states' rights by averting any dilution of the South's voting strength in Congress. It resulted directly from the belief that Hawaii's Senators might, as one Mississippi newspaper stated, "hold the decisive vote on all major legislation" involving "racial problems within the continental United States."³⁰ Similarly, a Texas newspaper argued that statehood would "give Hawaii the right to exercise two Senators worth of self-determination on the South."³¹

Much Southern opposition was also influenced by the belief that Hawaii's people could not be adequately assimilated into American society. This view was perhaps most clearly expressed by Preston (D. Ga.) who stated in the House debate:

What does it [the Hawaii bill] do? It makes citizens with equal rights with you and me of 180,000 Japanese. . . . It gives these people the same rights you and I have; we the descendants of those who created, fought and maintained this country. . . . When you give these people the same rights we have today, you will have two Senators speaking for those 180,000 Japanese.³²

Statehood supporters conceded that "the mixed racial character of the Hawaiian population" was a "principal ground for serious opposition," and attempted to expose it as "a dangerous form of racism."³³

Hawaii statehood "might be decided on the basis of realistic politics, not on its merits," a Hawaiian newspaper concluded in 1947.³⁴ An analysis of Congressional action (or non-action) on various Hawaii statehood bills after 1947 indicates the accuracy of this prediction. In the House, the anti-civil rights faction was seldom able to avert passage of statehood legislation. But the Southern Democrat-influenced House Rules Committee occasionally delayed

or at least complicated consideration of statehood bills by combining separate Hawaii and Alaska bills into a joint measure that was unacceptable to most Republicans and thus, unlike the separate Hawaii bill, did not enjoy majority bipartisan support in either chamber. In the Senate, the anti-civil rights faction averted affirmative action by promoting only a combined Hawaii-Alaska measure, delaying the reporting of bills from committee or initiating a filibuster as the ultimate means of averting affirmative Congressional action. With strong support from "Old Guard" Republicans, Southern Senators adopted a procedural strategy to defeat the Hawaii bill which was similar to that adopted to defeat Truman's civil rights program. In the early post-war years Senate opposition was more united and comparatively stronger than House opposition. Moreover, during 1947-1958 Senate opposition was the more effective because no substantive cloture rule was passed and thus the use of a Senate filibuster remained the decisive veto weapon for Congressional opponents.

Although the House passed the Hawaii bill in the first session of the Eightieth Congress, Senate opponents averted direct floor consideration of it during the second session. An attempt by influential Republican Senator Knowland (California) to discharge the bill from committee and have it debated by the Senate was rejected by a decisive margin of fifty-one votes to twenty in 1948. Fourteen Republicans and only six Democrats supported Knowland's resolution. "The list of opposing Republicans," one commentator observed, "reads like a roll-call of the Old Guard."³⁵ With only three exceptions, all Democrats who opposed the motion represented former Confederate states.³⁶

Congressional action on statehood legislation during 1947-1948 closely paralleled action on civil rights generally. Although some aspects of Truman's program passed the House, no part of it gained Senate approval. A coalition of conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats combined to defeat this legislation or avert floor consideration of it. Moreover, civil rights supporters failed to establish an effective cloture rule which theoretically would have provided a means of thwarting Southern-led filibusters and threats to filibuster against civil rights and statehood legislation.³⁷ Thus, although the numerical strength of the anti-civil rights, anti-statehood faction in the Senate was gradually eroded after 1947, use or threat of a filibuster by this faction remained effective in averting affirmative Senate action during 1949-1956.

House debate on Hawaii was averted during 1949 by the refusal

of the conservative House Rules Committee to schedule the bill for floor debate.³⁸ However, in January 1950 a move to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill was carried by the House.³⁹ Democratic and Republican leaders agreed to debate Alaska immediately before Hawaii.⁴⁰ On March 3, 1950 the House, by a vote of 186 to 146, approved Alaskan statehood for the first time.⁴¹ On March 7 the House again approved statehood for Hawaii. Support for Hawaii was much stronger than for Alaska, and significantly stronger than in 1947. The House approved the Hawaii bill in 1950 by a decisive 262 votes to 110. Opposition was restricted almost exclusively to a small minority of large-state Republicans and a substantial majority of Democrats from all Southern states except Florida and Louisiana.⁴²

The Democratic Senate leadership refused to schedule debate on statehood legislation prior to adjournment for the 1950 elections because of opposition from Southern Democrats to the legislation.⁴³ In the brief "lame-duck" session after the November elections Truman requested that the Senate immediately admit both Hawaii and Alaska. On November 28 the Senate began intermittent debate on Alaska.⁴⁴ Opposition to this bill was led by Southern Democrats Eastland (Miss.), Stennis (Miss.), Russell (Ga.), and the leading Republican opponent of statehood, Butler (Neb.). On December 4, Majority Leader Lucas acknowledged that opponents were prepared to filibuster to defeat statehood legislation, and deferred consideration of either statehood bill during 1950.⁴⁵ O'Mahoney (D. Wyo.) correctly alleged that the Southern-led resistance "constituted a full-scale filibuster" on the statehood issue.⁴⁶

Attempts to promote statehood during the Eighty-second Congress focused largely on the Senate, as proponents accepted that favorable House action would again prove futile unless preceded by an affirmative Senate vote. However the results of the 1950 elections substantially reduced the prospects of favorable action during 1951-52. Although the Democrats maintained majorities in both chambers of Congress, their Senate majority was reduced to only two seats.⁴⁷ This development confirmed the determination of the Democratic Party to retain its slight Senate majority by refusing to promote statehood for Hawaii without prior approval of Alaskan legislation. Thus the partisan political implications of the statehood issue acquired new significance after 1950.

Threats of a filibuster averted Senate debate on either statehood bill during 1951. However in February 1952 the Alaska bill was again debated by the Senate. It retained priority ahead of Hawaii

because the Truman Administration refused to permit consideration of "Republican" Hawaii ahead of "Democratic" Alaska.⁴⁸ "After a spirited debate which consumed the greater part of eleven days over a period of four weeks," the Senate voted to recommit the Alaska bill to committee for further investigation.⁴⁹ This action was tantamount to the defeat of both Alaska and Hawaii in the Eighty-second Congress.

The recommittal motion passed by a narrow one vote margin, 45 to 44, on February 27, 1952. Twenty-five Democrats, nineteen of whom represented Southern states, and twenty Republicans, including such conservatives as Taft (Ohio), Bridges (N.H.), and Butler, voted for recommittal, and thus against statehood. Twenty-four Democrats and twenty Republicans opposed recommittal.⁵⁰ Southern opponents "lobbied desperately" to gain support for recommittal by offering to support particular legislation favored by various Senators as the *quid pro-quo* for support for the recommittal motion.⁵¹

Republican-sponsored attempts to bring the Hawaii bill to the floor after recommittal of Alaska failed. On March 3, 1952, the Senate voted forty-seven to thirty-two to defer consideration of the Hawaii measure. In contrast to the previous Senate vote on Alaska, Hawaii did not receive strong bipartisan support. Only six Democrats and twenty-six Republicans favored consideration of the separate Hawaii bill.⁵² Many Democrats withdrew their support of Hawaii because the Alaska measure had previously been defeated. In the narrowly controlled Democratic Senate, defeat of Alaska inevitably resulted in simultaneous defeat of Hawaii.

Republican victories in the House, Senate and Presidential elections of 1952 did not help to extricate Congressional consideration of Hawaii from the influence of partisan political factors during the Eighty-third Congress. Rather, the policy adopted by the new Republican Administration strengthened the negative influence of these factors, and made the use of filibusters by the Southern faction unnecessary.

The Republican Party retained only a one seat majority in the Senate during 1954.⁵³ In an attempt to increase this majority to three, Eisenhower vigorously promoted the separate admission of Hawaii but refused to give Alaskan statehood unequivocal endorsement.⁵⁴ This policy precipitated bitter party division on statehood, which opponents of either territory effectively capitalized on.

On March 10, 1953 a separate Hawaii bill passed the House by a vote of 274 to 138. Although the measure again enjoyed consider-

able bipartisan support, Democratic opposition was stronger than in 1947 or 1950.⁵⁵ Moreover, the fact that Democrats did not unite to oppose the bill reflected a belief that Alaska would be considered by the House later in 1953. However the House Rules Committee refused to report the Alaska bill for floor debate in 1953.

The Senate commenced consideration of the separate Hawaii bill in March 1954. Immediately, liberal and conservative Democrats and a small number of anti-statehood Republicans united to oppose consideration of the separate Hawaii bill. Minority Leader Lyndon Johnson stated that Democrats would adopt this strategy because Eisenhower had made statehood a partisan issue by refusing to promote Alaska.⁵⁶ He emphasized that even if separate bills passed both chambers during 1954, Eisenhower would veto Alaska and thereby increase Republican voting strength in Congress.⁵⁷ On March 10, 1954 the Senate passed a Democratic-sponsored motion to combine the Hawaii and Alaska bills by a narrow margin of 46 votes to 43. Support for combining the bills derived from forty-two Democrats and only three Republicans and the independent, Senator Morse.⁵⁸ As Senator Holland had correctly predicted, "a curious looking team . . . composed of those who are completely against statehood aligned with those who are strongly in favor of both territories," supported the motion.⁵⁹ Statehood opponents voted to combine the bills because they were confident it would never pass the Senate.

The combined bill was debated intermittently in the Senate for almost three weeks in March, 1954. Early in the debate Southern Democrats threatened to filibuster. After speaking for four hours Eastland stated on March 16 that he had barely reached the "preface" of the remarks, and emphasized that he would take possibly four days to complete them.⁶⁰ However a protracted filibuster did not develop. The decision of the anti-statehood faction to permit a Senate vote resulted from a realization that a filibuster was unnecessary. Opponents were confident the House would not pass the combined bill. Fulbright (D. Ark.) stated prior to the Senate vote: "We are told that definitely the House will never pass a bill granting statehood for Alaska."⁶¹ The withdrawal of opposition to a Senate vote possibly resulted directly from a specific Republican assurance that the House would not consider the combined bill prior to conclusion of the Eighty-third Congress.⁶²

The Senate passed the combined bill by a decisive 57 votes to 28 on April 1, 1954. Although the vote reflected the continuance of a liberal-conservative division on statehood,⁶³ it also indicated that

Hawaii enjoyed majority, bipartisan support in the Senate when the question of admission was isolated from partisan politics.

The House did not debate the combined bill during 1954. Opposition from the Republican Administration and House Democratic leader Rayburn (Texas), an opponent of statehood for either territory, averted the calling of a conference of senior members of the House and Senate to resolve differences in the House and Senate versions of statehood legislation.⁶⁴ In July the House Rules Committee voted to end consideration of the combined bill and refused to forward it to floor of the House.⁶⁵

The altered composition of Congress and the legislature of Hawaii during 1955-1956 further aggravated the negative influence of party politics on the statehood question, and provided conditions which Southern opponents effectively exploited. The Democrats gained majorities in both chambers of Congress in the 1954 elections. In the Senate, however, they gained a majority of only one seat.⁶⁶ Perhaps more significantly, the Democratic Party gained control of the Hawaii legislature for the first time in 1954.⁶⁷ Moreover, it increased its majorities in both chambers of the Alaska legislature.⁶⁸ Statehood opponents stressed the implications of these election results for the national Republican Party: "Based on the 1954 election returns," Representative Pillion (R.N.Y.) emphasized, "it appears that, in the event of statehood, Alaska would surely elect 2 Democratic Senators and Hawaii would be likely to elect 2 Democratic Senators."⁶⁹ Cognizant of this possibility, Republicans were reluctant to increase Democratic strength in the narrowly divided Congress by admitting either territory during the Eighty-fourth Congress.

Increased Southern Democratic influence in Congress also decreased the prospects of affirmative action during 1955-1956. The new Senate Majority Leader, Johnson, and House Speaker, Rayburn, were both opposed to statehood for Hawaii. The new chairman of the House Rules Committee, Smith (Va.), was an implacable opponent of statehood.⁷⁰ Moreover, statehood opponents comprised a majority of the Rules Committee.⁷¹ As these three Southern Democrats and the Rules Committee largely determined what legislation Congress would or would not debate, the prospects of favorable action on statehood were further reduced.

In April, 1955, the House Rules Committee granted a rule which permitted House debate on a combined statehood bill, but was unacceptable to either Republican supporters of Hawaii or Democratic supporters of both territories. One proponent described it as "a monstrosity of a rule" designed to defeat both territories.⁷² The

committee granted a "closed rule," which prohibited amendments being made to the bill and thus precluded any attempt to debate the separate admission of either territory. Committee opponents correctly assumed that the combined bill would again be defeated because of Republican opposition to Alaska.⁷³

The House considered the combined bill briefly on May 9 and May 10, 1955, before voting 281 to 170 to recommit it to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for additional investigation. Both parties divided over the issue, but in contrast to previous House votes on separate Hawaii bills, Republicans offered strongest support for recommitment and hence strongest opposition to simultaneous admission of both territories. More than sixty percent of House Republicans, and more than ninety percent of Democratic Representatives of the eleven Southern states, supported recommitment.⁷⁴ No further action was taken on statehood by either chamber during 1955-1956.

Although Hawaii statehood legislation passed the House three times during 1947-1953, by the end of 1956 the Senate had never voted on a separate Hawaii bill. The Senate had passed a joint Hawaii-Alaska bill, but the House had never passed a combined measure. However, during 1957-1959 a combination of factors led to a marked breakdown of the intensity of both politically motivated and sectional opposition to the separate admission of either territory. In this altered Congressional environment statehood proponents were able to gain strong bipartisan support in both chambers for a compromise strategy which promoted the separate admissions of both territories.

Civil rights legislation gained increasing public and Congressional support during the 1950's. The introduction of a civil rights program by Eisenhower in 1956 was more a response to growing demands for such legislation than a reflection of the President's willingness to promote progressive racial legislation.⁷⁵ Increasingly, many Congressmen accepted that the denial of equal rights to almost ten percent of United States citizens was an embarrassing anomaly in a country based ostensibly on a concept of freedom and equality for all. This development, coupled with the growth of Republican support in Negro districts in the 1956 elections, contributed to the emergence of a coalition of Northern Democrats and an overwhelming majority of moderate Republicans who endorse passage of moderate civil rights legislation in 1957.⁷⁶

Confronted with a pro-civil rights majority in the Senate, Southern Democrats and the few Republican opponents of civil rights adopted

a compromise procedure in Congress. Lacking sufficient votes to defeat the civil rights program, the conservative faction attempted to modify provisions of the legislation rather than defeat it outright. Some civil rights opponents anticipated that initiation of a filibuster against the legislation would strengthen the determination of liberal Democrats to establish stronger rules against the filibuster and possibly encourage moderate Republicans to support establishment of an effective cloture rule. Early in 1957 the Senate again rejected a motion to consider adoption of a strong cloture rule. The defeat of this motion resulted largely from the opposition of a majority of Republican Senators, many of whom favored the adoption of mild civil rights legislation during 1957. Southern Democrats accepted that initiation of a filibuster against civil rights legislation might alienate many of these Republicans, and thereby increase Senate support for cloture.⁷⁷ Thus, during 1957 no filibuster was waged to defeat the civil rights program.

The absence of a filibuster was not a reflection of general Southern acceptance of the Eisenhower program. Rather, as Shuman has convincingly argued, "the failure of the filibuster may be regarded as a carefully calculated decision to avoid consequences which would have been worse, from the Southern point of view, than those of the bill as it passed the Senate."⁷⁸ By adopting a compromise strategy, civil rights opponents succeeded in gaining sufficient Senate support to modify some important provisions of the 1957 bill.⁷⁹ Yet as C. Van Woodward and others have pointed out, the adoption of a compromise strategy and a more conciliatory rhetoric by civil rights opponents did not reflect a decline in Southern determination to oppose external intervention in state matters. Rather, it reflected their continued determination to resist Federal encroachments on "the Southern way of life." The flexible strategy adopted by the anti-civil rights faction was more a response to the exigencies of Congressional politics than a symptom of modified attitudes of most Southerners on racial issues.⁸⁰ Nonetheless, the very fact that by 1957 the anti-civil rights faction was forced to compromise its position on racial issues in Congress, had far reaching implications for Hawaii statehood.

Passage of the 1957 civil rights bill was, as Shuman has emphasized, "the first important occasion" after 1938 when the conservative coalition was defeated in Congress.⁸¹ It indicated that a new coalition of liberal Democrats and moderate Republicans was prepared to support moderate civil rights legislation. After 1957 this majority coalition also gave strong support to the related civil rights

issues of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The 1957 vote on civil rights also indicated that although the admission of four new Senators from Hawaii and Alaska might increase "liberal" strength in Congress, these new Senators would not be decisive in determining national policy on civil rights. The addition of "liberal" Senators from Hawaii and Alaska was no longer viewed as a necessary precondition for the passage of civil rights legislation. Thus, Congressional opponents of civil rights were more amenable to compromise on the statehood issue after 1957. This is not to suggest that strong opposition to an increase in the number of states suddenly dissipated. Nonetheless, after 1957 states' rights opponents of statehood reluctantly accepted that strong conservative influence in Congress and the Democratic Party could best be maintained by compromise, rather than by continued intransigent opposition to civil rights or statehood legislation. The failure of opponents to invoke filibusters against statehood legislation after 1957, and their reluctant acceptance of a compromise procedural strategy sponsored by Democratic proponents to break the political stalemate on statehood, is strong evidence of this.

No floor action was taken on statehood in either chamber of Congress in 1957. In 1958, however, Congress took decisive action. In January, Johnson convened a vitally important confidential conference of Democratic supporters of both territories. The newly elected Hawaii Delegate to Congress, John Burns (the first Democrat to fill this position after World War II) and leading Senate proponents attended.⁸² This group agreed to support Congressional action on Alaska only during 1958. Liberal Democratic supporters of both territories endorsed this arrangement in return for assurances from Johnson and Rayburn that the Alaska bill would definitely be debated and voted on in both chambers before the close of the Eighty-fifth Congress.⁸³ Burns actively supported the plan because he was confident the admission of Alaska would break the political impasse in Congress which had perennially contributed to the defeat of statehood for either territory.⁸⁴ Following this meeting Democratic proponents conceded that Hawaii would not be voted on in either chamber during 1958.⁸⁵

This Democratic strategy was enthusiastically accepted by virtually all Democratic Congressmen who did not represent Southern constituencies. It remained "a basic tenet of political faith on Capitol Hill" that Alaska's admission "means two Democratic Senators," the *New York Times* observed early in 1958.⁸⁶ With Senate elections due in November 1958, Democrats were aware that two

additional Democratic Senators might ensure continued Democratic control of the Senate. Yet general Democratic acceptance of the "Alaska only" strategy was also conditioned by a number of other significant influences. Adoption of this strategy placated Democratic statehood proponents who accepted that Alaska's admission in 1958 would make affirmative Congressional action on Hawaii "inevitabel" in 1959.⁸⁷ Moreover, the strategy was a compromise which minimized sectional division within the party over the related statehood and civil rights issues. It offered some protection for Southern interests within the Democratic Party and Congress because it ensured that, at most, only one "liberal" state would be admitted in 1958. Southern acceptance of the strategy also resulted in part from a belief that without substantial Republican support for "Democratic" Alaska, the northern territory would not gain the requisite votes in either chamber for admission in 1958. The anti-statehood faction possibly miscalculated early in 1958 by assuming that the Republican Party would continue to oppose the separate admission of Alaska. Also, opponents possibly reasoned that in the absence of this compromise strategy, the majority coalition of pro-statehood Democrats and Republicans might vote to admit both territories in 1958. For opponents the strategy was at least a certain way of delaying the admission of multiracial Hawaii and, even better, a possible means for again defeating both territories.

Early in 1958 Republican proponents refused to support Alaskan statehood without an explicit assurance from Democratic leaders that Hawaii would also be considered by both houses of Congress in 1958.⁸⁸ However sustained attempts to oppose the separate Alaska bill, or to again combine the Alaska and Hawaii bills, did not gain majority support from Republicans. The compromise strategy adopted by the Democratic Party confronted the Republican Party with a major dilemma. Pro-statehood Republicans could not collaborate with Southern Democrats to defeat the separate Alaska bill, without simultaneously undermining subsequent bipartisan support for Hawaii. Moreover this procedure would have suggested that the Republican Party, not the Democrats, opposed the admission of either territory. The Republican Party would thus have assumed responsibility for the defeat of statehood legislation which constituted a major portion of Eisenhower's proposed legislative program during the Eighty-fifth Congress. The Republican Party had advocated the immediate admission of Hawaii for a decade. In 1957 it also endorsed the immediate admission of Alaska. Few Republicans were prepared to accept responsibility for the defeat of statehood legislation for

either territory in 1958. Nor could the Republican Party support attempts to combine the Alaska and Hawaii bills without displaying considerable hypocrisy. Prior to 1957 the Republican Party had consistently denounced the Democratic sponsored attempts to combine the statehood bills as a politically motivated maneuver designed to defeat the admission of both territories. Thus in 1958 Democratic proponents alleged that Republican efforts to combine the bill would constitute a deliberate attempt to defeat statehood for both territories.⁸⁹ Also, as the *New York Times* remarked, the Republican Party was reluctant to continue its "unremitting hostility" to Alaska because this may have alienated Alaskan voters and thus further consolidated Democratic strength in Alaska.⁹⁰ Republican opposition to Alaska may also have had adverse political repercussions for Republican candidates in the 1958 Hawaii elections. Finally, most Republicans supported Alaska statehood because they expected that this action would be a tangible step to the quick admission of Hawaii. Indeed many Republican proponents genuinely believed that they could gain the support of liberal Democrats for the admission of Hawaii in 1958, immediately following passage of the Alaska bill.⁹¹ By 1958 it was not politically expedient for the Republican Party to assume responsibility for the defeat of statehood for either territory.

The separate Alaska bill passed the House by a vote of 210 to 66 on May 28, 1958. Although both parties divided over the measure, majorities of both parties voted affirmatively.⁹² After almost a week of intermittent debate, the Senate voted on the separate admission of Alaska on June 30, 1958. The bill passed by an overwhelming 64 votes to 20. Only thirteen Democrats—twelve of whom represented Southern states—and seven Republicans opposed Alaska's admission.⁹³ As in previous years the conservative coalition remained opposed to any expansion of the Union, but by 1958 this coalition no longer commanded the support of a substantial number of Senators. Senate voting alignments on the 1957 civil rights act and the 1958 Alaska bill were very similar. With only two exceptions, all Senators who voted for Alaska also voted for the civil rights legislation.⁹⁴ Thus, in large measure, the coalition of liberal Democrats and moderate Republicans which had endorsed the civil rights bill was temporarily revived in 1958 to support statehood for Alaska. The following year these factions again combined to promote the admission of Hawaii.

By 1958, for the first time, separate statehood bills enjoyed majority, bipartisan support in both chambers of Congress, and were no longer threatened by the delaying tactics previously employed by

statehood opponents. The favorable developments which expedited passage of the Alaska bill were not reversed after 1958. The Democratic Party retained control of both Houses of Congress and Johnson and Rayburn retained their respective positions as Senate Majority Leader and House Speaker. They were thus able to implement the final aspect of the compromise strategy adopted by the Democrats in January 1958—the admission of Hawaii early in the eighty-sixth Congress.

On March 9, 1959, Johnson scheduled Senate consideration of the Hawaii bill for the following day. Also, on March 10 the House Rules Committee by seven votes to four scheduled House debate on the Hawaii bill for March 11. This unexpected decision was partly the product of pressure from Democratic leaders in the House and Senate.⁹⁵

“From the outset” of the debate, the *New York Times* observed, “approval of statehood for Hawaii was a settled matter.”⁹⁶ After less than one day of debate, on March 11, 1959, the Senate approved the Hawaii bill by an overwhelming 76 votes to 15.⁹⁷ On the same day the House adopted by 338 votes to 69, a rule providing for immediate consideration of the Hawaii bill. Unanimous consent was granted on March 12 to substitute the Senate approved bill (S. 50) for the House bill (H.R. 4221), and after six hours of debate the vote was taken. The House approved Hawaii statehood by a margin of 323 votes to only 89.⁹⁸ Thus, “after one of the fastest actions by Congress in years,” the *New York Times* commented, “only the mechanics of admitting a new state remain before Hawaii joins the Union.”⁹⁹

The voting alignments on Hawaii conformed closely with those on Alaska in 1958 and civil rights in 1957. Of the sixty-five Democratic Representatives who voted negatively in the House, only two did not represent former Confederate states. Five large Northern states—Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania—provided seventeen of the twenty-four negative Republican votes.¹⁰⁰ The fifteen negative Senate votes were cast by fourteen Southern Democrats and one Republican.¹⁰¹ All but one of the fourteen Southern Senators who voted against Hawaii also voted with the eighteen opponents of the 1957 Civil Rights Act. Eleven of these fourteen Senators also voted against the Alaska bill in 1958.¹⁰²

Acceptance of the insular territory of Hawaii as a state in 1959 was an unprecedented development in United States history. It irrevocably extended the boundaries of the United States beyond their traditional continental limits. It also incorporated permanently

into the Union a state with a population of predominantly Asiatic extraction. Yet the unique geographical location of Hawaii and the composition of its population *per se* were not the major obstacles to statehood. Resistance to admission of Hawaii was motivated largely by the determination of the anti-civil rights faction to maintain the sectional and political status-quo in Congress, and to thereby preserve the existing influence of their particular states and geographic section on national decision making. This faction perennially employed complex procedural strategies in Congressional committees and on the floor of the Senate to delay or defeat the admission of Hawaii, primarily because the admission of Senators from the tolerant, multiracial islands threatened to undermine the ability of this faction to avert passage of civil rights and related legislation by Congress. The effectiveness of these strategies was compounded by the impact of the Alaskan statehood issue and the determination of groups within both major parties to reap political advantage by promoting the separate admission of only one territory. Nonetheless, the relationship of statehood to the divisive civil rights issue was the basic reason for the prolonged post-war delay by Congress over the admission of Hawaii. National debates over the admission of such territories as Missouri and Maine, Kansas and Nebraska, or California, were perhaps more bitter but less protracted than debate on Hawaii's admission. With the important exception of the bitter sectional resistance manifest against the admission of "free" or "slave" territories from the time of the Missouri Compromise of 1821 to the outbreak of the Civil War, no territory confronted more vigorous or determined sectionally based opposition to its appeals for admission than Hawaii.

NOTES

¹ Senator Lewis Cass, quoted in testimony by Jack M. Fox, U.S. Congress, Senate, *Statehood for Hawaii*, Hearings, 85th Cong., 1st sess., April 1-2, 1957, p. 51.

² All Congressional reports on Hawaiian statehood issued during 1935-1959 accepted that the fulfilment of these traditional criteria was a necessary precondition for statehood. See, for example, U.S. Congress, Senate, *Statehood for Hawaii*, Report 314, 82d Cong., 1st sess., May 8, 1951, p. 8.

³ For a detailed summary of the dates and durations of these hearings and debates, see generally, Donald Dedmon, "The Functions of Discourse in the Hawaiian Statehood Debates," *Speech Monographs*, XXXIII, No. 1 (1966), pp.

- 30-39. Twenty-one separate hearings were conducted by Congressional investigating committees on Hawaiian statehood after 1935. Testimony was accepted on more than 100 days from more than 700 witnesses during these hearings, six of which were conducted in Hawaii. Approximately 6,500 pages (more than three million words) of committee hearings and reports were published. A total of 327 Congressmen spoke in the various debates on statehood during 1947-1959. Only 80 of these speakers opposed admission.
- ⁴ Hawaii Statehood Commission, *Statehood for Hawaii* (Honolulu, 1959), p. 16s
 - ⁵ For brief accounts of Hawaii's early attempts to promote statehood, see Charler Hunter "49th State? . . .," *American Heritage* (Spring 1951), pp. 10-12, 73; o. Ben Hyams, "Tough Job to Get that 'Yes' Vote," *HA*, June 23, 1959, pp. 2-3.
 - ⁶ See generally, Richard Roach, "The Hawaiian Statehood Plebiscite of 1940," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii, 1952.
 - ⁷ Hawaii Statehood Commission, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13. The percentage favoring increased from 60% in 1946 to 72% in 1958.
 - ⁸ U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on Hawaii, *Statehood for Hawaii, Report*, 75th Cong., 3d sess., January 5, 1938, p. 94.
 - ⁹ Hawaii Statehood Commission, *op. cit.*, pp. 2, 8-15.
 - ¹⁰ See generally, Hawaii Statehood Commission, Papers, AH, various folders entitled "Clippings, Editorial Comment Etc"; and Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, Papers, AH, various folders entitled "Newspapers—Editorial Comment (Statehood)," and "Statehood Clipping."
 - ¹¹ Donald Dedmon, "An Analysis of the Argument in the Debate in Congress on the Admission of Hawaii to the Union," unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Iowa, 1961, p. 445.
 - ¹² Ralph S. Kuykendall, "The Evolution of Hawaii's Government," in U.S. Congress, Senate, *Administration in Hawaii, Hearings*, 73d Cong., 2d sess., January 16, 1933, p. 139. See also, William C. Dill, *Statehood for Hawaii* (Philadelphia, 1949), pp. 25-27; Carl B. Swisher, *American Constitutional Development* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), pp. 476-81; and Marcos E. Kinevan, "Alaska and Hawaii: From Territoriality to Statehood," *California Law Review*, XXXVIII (June, 1950), p. 276.
 - ¹³ *Congressional Record*, 80 Cong., 1 Sess., 1947, p. 2906; Appendix, U.S. Congress, House, *Statehood for Hawaii, Hearings*, 79 Cong., 2 Sess., January 7-18, 1946, pp. 546A-550C. For a brief survey of Hawaii's economic development by 1959, see, Hawaii Statehood Commission, *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 34-42.
 - ¹⁴ U.S. Congress, Senate, *Statehood for Hawaii, Report*, 82d Cong., 1st sess., May 8, 1951, p. 8.
 - ¹⁵ Appendix, U.S. Congress, House, *Statehood for Hawaii, Hearings*, 1946, p. 547. In 1945 the population comprised: 172,583 Caucasians (34.4%); 163,300 Japanese (32.5%); 61,422 Part-Hawaiians (12.2%); 46,464 Filipinos (9.3%); 9,090 Puerto Ricans (1.8%); 7,042 Koreans (1.4%); all others, 1,228 (0.2%).
 - ¹⁶ Andrew Lind, *Hawaii's People* (Honolulu, 1967), pp. 106-07.
 - ¹⁷ Lind, testimony, U.S. Congress, House, *Statehood for Hawaii, Hearings*, 1946, p. 559.
 - ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Appendix, p. 548.
 - ¹⁹ *Christian Science Monitor*, January 14, 1946, Section II, p. 9. For contemporary assessments of race relations in Hawaii, see, U.S. Congress, House, *Statehood for Hawaii, Hearings*, 1946, pp. 234-35, 255-56, 262-63, 487-88, 509-11, 534-36, 597-99, 600-04. Lind, *op. cit.*, is an excellent study of race relations in Hawaii.

- ²⁰ U.S. Congress, House, *Statehood for Hawaii, Hearings*, 1946, pp. 547-48.
- ²¹ On November 7, 1950, the draft constitution was endorsed by 82,788 voters and opposed by 27,109. See HSB, November 8, 1950, p. 1.
- ²² *New York Times*, January 8, 1948, p. 4.
- ²³ *New York Times*, February 3, 1948, p. 22.
- ²⁴ For details of this vote, see, Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, 1945-1961 (Washington, 1965), pp. 46a-47a.
- ²⁵ HSB, July 3, 1947, p. 6.
- ²⁶ From 1910 to 1956 the Republican Party always secured a majority, or half the seats, in both houses of the territorial legislature. See, Hawaii Department of Planning and Research, *Historical Statistics of Hawaii, 1778 to 1962* (Honolulu, 1962), p. 25.
- ²⁷ U.S. Congress, House, *Hawaii-Alaska Statehood, Hearings*, 84 Cong., 1 Sess., January-February, 1955, pp. 300-01.
- ²⁸ *Congressional Record*, 80 Cong., 1 Sess., 1947, p. 7035.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, Larcade, p. 7921.
- ³⁰ *Jackson Clarion Ledger*, July 3, 1947, quoted, *Congressional Record*, 50 Cong., 1 Sess., 1947, p. 9468.
- ³¹ *Houston Post*, July 4, 1947, quoted, *Ibid.*
- ³² *Congressional Record*, 80 Cong., 1 Sess., 1947, p. 7936. A similar statement was made by the influential Howard Smith (D. Va.) to a Senate investigating committee in 1954: "I know it is considered very bad form to mention race and one is considered out of date and old fashioned if he has any idea that this country is still America for Americans and is the country built by the Caucasian race. . . . We have never had a State admitted into the Union that was not predominately Caucasian." (Smith, testimony, U.S. Congress, Senate, *Statehood for Hawaii Hearings*, 83d Cong., 1st and 2d sessions, June 1953-January 1954, p. 402). On another occasion Smith protested that if Hawaii was admitted as a state "the vote of one Chinaman in Hawaii would be worth as much as the votes of 31 citizens of New York when it came to electing Senators." Smith, quoted, Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congressional Quarterly Almanac*, 83d Congress, 1st Session, 1953, IX (Washington, 1953), p. 302.
- ³³ Hale (R. Maine), *Congressional Record*, 80 Cong., 1 Sess., 1947, p. 7934.
- ³⁴ *Hilo Tribune Herald*, October 9, 1947, p. 2.
- ³⁵ HSB, May 20, 1948, p. 1.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*; See also, *New York Times*, May 21, 1948, p. 16; Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, p. 45a.
- ³⁷ William C. Berman, "Civil Rights and Civil Liberties," in Richard S. Kirkendall (ed.), *The Truman Period as a Research Field* (Columbia, 1967), p. 194.
- ³⁸ George McLane, *Report of the Washington Office, Hawaii Statehood Commission May-August, 1949* (mimeographed), p. 2. (Hawaii Statehood Commission, Papers, AH).
- ³⁹ *Congressional Record*, 81 Cong., 2 Sess., 1950, pp. 783-4.
- ⁴⁰ *New York Times*, January 24, 1950, p. 23.
- ⁴¹ *New York Times*, March 4, 1950, pp. 1, 4.
- ⁴² *Congressional Record*, 81 Cong., 2 Sess., 1950, p. 2947.
- ⁴³ *New York Times*, August 6, 1950, Section IV, p. 10; HA, September 15, 1950, p. 3.
- ⁴⁴ *New York Times*, November 29, 1950, p. 36.

- ⁴⁵ HSB, December 4, 1950, p. 1.
- ⁴⁶ O'Mahoney, quoted, Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, p. 1500.
- ⁴⁷ The composition of the Senate in 1949-50 was: Democrats 54, Republicans 42. During 1951-52 it was: Democrats 49, Republicans 47.
- ⁴⁸ HSB, February 5, 1952, p. 1.
- ⁴⁹ Gruening, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
- ⁵⁰ Democrats Holland (Florida), Sparkman (Alabama) and Kefauver (Tennessee) were the only representatives of Southern states to oppose recommitment. The Western and mountain states offered strongest opposition to recommitment. The twelve states which voted solidly against recommitment were: California, Oregon, Montana, Connecticut, Minnesota, Rhode Island, New York, New Mexico, Wyoming, West Virginia, and Washington. Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, p. 46a.
- ⁵¹ *Newsweek*, March 10, 1952, p. 28.
- ⁵² *New York Times*, March 4, 1952, pp. 1, 12.
- ⁵³ The composition of the 83d Congress was: Senate: Republicans 48, Democrats 47, and one independent; House: Republicans 221, Democrats 213, others 1.
- ⁵⁴ See for example, *New York Times*, February 3, 1953, p. 12; Mack (D., Ill.), *Congressional Record*, 83 Cong., 1 Sess., 1953, p. 1824.
- ⁵⁵ *Congressional Record*, 83 Cong., 1 Sess., 1953, pp. 1828-29. In 1947, 77 Democrats opposed Hawaii; in 1950, 88 voted negatively; and in 1953, 100 Democrats opposed the Hawaii bill.
- ⁵⁶ HSB, March 4, 1954, p. 1.
- ⁵⁷ HA, March 6, 1954, p. 1.
- ⁵⁸ *Congressional Record*, 3 Cong., 2 Sess., 1954, p. 3091. See also, *New York Times*, March 12, 1954, pp. 1, 13. The three Republicans who supported the motion were: Malone, Langer (N.D.) and Butler (Maryland).
- ⁵⁹ *Congressional Record*, 83 Cong., 2 Sess., 1954, p. 3076.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3330.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 3954.
- ⁶² *Time*, April 12, 1954, p. 15, for example, concluded that Republican House Leader Martin "made no secret of Republican plans to let the bill die quietly." See also, *New York Times*, March 28, 1954, p. 56.
- ⁶³ *Congressional Record*, 83 Cong., 1 Sess., 1954, p. 4343. Nineteen Democrats, and only nine Republicans, voted negatively. Only three Southern Democrats supported the bill.
- ⁶⁴ *Congressional Record*, 83 Cong., 2 Sess., 1954, p. 5002. See also, *New York Times*, April 13, 1954, p. 28; HSB, July 14, 1954, p. 1.
- ⁶⁵ *New York Times*, July 27, 1954, p. 1.
- ⁶⁶ The composition of the 84th Congress was: Senate: Democrats, 48, Republicans 47, and one independent; House: Democrats, 232, Republicans, 203, others, 1.
- ⁶⁷ Hawaii, Department of Planning and Research, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
- ⁶⁸ Pillion, testimony, U.S. Congress, House, *Hawaii-Alaska Statehood, Hearings*, 1955, p. 301.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 300-01.
- ⁷⁰ Johnson, Rayburn and Smith had always voted against the admission of either territory, either directly or by supporting recommitment motions. See, Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, 46a-47a, 64a-65a, 70a-71a,

- ¹⁷ See Allen Otten, "Here's How 12 Men Control Congress," *Nations' Business*, XLIV (February, 1956), p. 34, for details of members of the committee. For information on how these members voted on statehood in 1953, see, Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, pp. 64a-65a.
- ⁷² *Congressional Record*, 84 Cong., 1 Sess., 1955, p. 5880.
- ⁷³ *Congressional Quarterly Almanac*, 84th Congress, 1955, XI (Washington, 1955), p. 374.
- ⁷⁴ *Congressional Record*, 84 Cong., 1 Sess., 1955, pp. 5975-76. Northern and Western Democrats and Republicans from Washington and California gave strongest opposition to recommitment.
- ⁷⁵ Daniel Berman, *A Bill Becomes Law: Congress Enacts Civil Rights Legislation* (New York, 1966), p. 136.
- ⁷⁶ Howard Shuman, "Senate Rules and the Civil Rights Bill: A Case Study," *American Political Science Review*, II, No. 4 (1957), p. 969.
- ⁷⁷ Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, p. 1621.
- ⁷⁸ Shuman, *op. cit.*, p. 974. Senator Russell (D. Ga.) acknowledged the reasons why the filibuster was not used: "There was not a man amongst us who was not willing to speak against this iniquitous bill until he dropped in his tracks. We would have done so but for the conviction, growing out of our knowledge of the Senate and our experience of many years in this body, that a filibuster was certain to make a bad bill infinitely worse."
- ⁷⁹ Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, p. 1621.
- ⁸⁰ Woodward, quoted, Dewey W. Grantham, "The South and the Politics of Sectionalism," in Grantham (ed.) *The South and the Sectional Image* (New York, 1967), pp. 48-49. During 1954-1956, for example, the eleven Southern states adopted approximately one hundred prosegregation acts.
- ⁸¹ Shuman, *op. cit.*, p. 961.
- ⁸² HSB, January 28, 1958, p. 1.
- ⁸³ In a private interview with the author of this paper on May 7, 1970, Burns (now Governor of Hawaii) confirmed that such assurances were given. See also, Letter, Burns to Church (D. Idaho) February 5, 1958, quoted by Church, *Congressional Record*, 85 Cong., 2 Sess., 1958, p. 7988.
- ⁸⁴ HSB, October 16, 1957, p. 1; Burns, quoted by Murray (D. Mont.), *Congressional Record*, 85 Cong., 2 Sess., 1958, p. 3200.
- ⁸⁵ *Congressional Quarterly Almanac*, 85th Congress, 2d session, 1958, XIV (Washington, 1959), p. 285.
- ⁸⁶ *New York Times*, February 23, 1958, Section IV, p. 7.
- ⁸⁷ Church, quoted, HSB, January 28, 1958, p. 1. See also, statements by O'Brien (D.N.Y.) and Burns, *Congressional Record*, 85 Cong., 2 Sess., 1958, pp. 13738-39.
- ⁸⁸ See for example Knowland, *Congressional Record*, 85 Cong., 2 Sess., 1958, p. 7986.
- ⁸⁹ Murray, *Congressional Record*, 85 Cong., 2 Sess., 1958, pp. 11944-45.
- ⁹⁰ *New York Times*, June 8, 1958, Section IV, p. 9.
- ⁹¹ See for example, Sheehan (R. Ill.), *Congressional Record*, 85 Cong., 2 Sess., 1958, p. 13734.
- ⁹² Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, pp. 78a-79a.
- ⁹³ *Congressional Record*, 85 Cong., 2 Sess., 1958, pp. 11944-45. Five Southern states—Arkansas, Georgia, Virginia, Mississippi and South Carolina provided half of the total opposition votes.
- ⁹⁴ See Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, pp. 74a-78a, for details of Senate voting on these bills.

- ⁹⁵ *New York Times*, March 11, 1959, p. 1; Burns, private interview, May 7, 1971, stressed the importance of Johnson and Rayburn in this development.
- ⁹⁶ *New York Times*, March 12, 1959, p. 1.
- ⁹⁷ *Congressional Record*, 86 Cong., 1 Sess., 1959, p. 3890.
- ⁹⁸ *Congressional Record*, 86 Cong., 1 Sess., 1959, pp. 4038-39.
- ⁹⁹ *New York Times*, March 13, 1959, p. 1.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Congressional Record*, 86 Cong., 1 Sess., 1959, pp. 4038-39.
- ¹⁰¹ *Congressional Record*, 86 Cong., 1 Sess., 1959, p. 3890. Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia all voted solidly against Hawaii. Smathers (D. Fla.), Ellender (D. La.) and Butler (R. Md.) also voted negatively.
- ¹⁰² For details of Congressional votes on these three bills, see, Congressional Quarterly Service, *Congress and the Nation*, pp. 74a-82a.